

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to the entry of this Amendment, claims 1-18, 22-40, 42-45 and 47-49 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 24, 32, 40 and 45 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and no claims have been added herein. Therefore, claims 1-18, 22-40, 42-45 and 47-49 remain pending in this application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these claims for at least the reasons presented below.

Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 1, 24, 32, 40 and 45 can be found at least at page 31, lines 1-5 of the Specification.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection, Stolfo and Wood

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-18, 22-40, 42-45 and 47-49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0002903 to Stolfo et al. (hereinafter "Stolfo") and U. S. Patent No. 6,609,198 to Wood et al. (hereinafter "Wood"). The Applicants respectfully submit that, for at least the following reasons, this rejection should be withdrawn.

The Applicants submit that Stolfo is directed to "transactions over a communications network between first and second parties . . . while securing private and personal information specific to the first party or the network device used by the first party with respect to the second party." (page 1, paragraph 1, lines 1-7). Under Stolfo, communications and/or transactions can be carried out between a user or first party, typically a consumer, and a second party, typically a merchant, over a communication network in which information is provided and/or a good is ordered while securing such information of the first party with respect to at least the second party. (page 4, paragraph 43). A user or first party may communicate over the network with a second party, using a proxy that anonymizing (i.e., making anonymous) the first party with regard to the second party. (page 4, paragraph 47). In other words, the proxy of Stolfo acts as a middleman that hides the identity of the first party from the second party. (page 16, paragraph 184 and paragraph. 187).

The Applicants submit that Wood is directed to "security architecture... in which a single sign-on is provided for multiple information resources." (col. 2, lines 26-28). A "log-on

service obtains credentials for an entity... with trust-level requirements of an information resource... [and] once [the] credentials have been obtained for [the] entity and have been authenticated to a given trust level, access is granted, without the need for further credentials and authentication." (col. 2, lines 35-42). Stated differently, once a user has logged on and is authenticated, the user can access multiple resources without having to logon again.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-18, 22 and 23 depend, is directed to a method for allowing proxies in an integrated Identity System and Access System. Claim 24, upon which claims 25-31 depend is directed to a processor storage device having code for programming a processor to perform a method. Claim 32, upon which claims 33-39 depend, is directed to an apparatus that allows for proxies in an integrated Identity System and Access System. Claim 40, upon which claims 42-44 depend are directed to a method for allowing proxies in an integrated Identity System and Access System. Claim 45, upon which claims 47-49 depend, is directed to a processor storage device having code for programming a processor to perform a method. Claims 1, 24, 32, 40 and 45, as amended, each essentially recite in part "allowing said user to use said Access System to access resources as proxy for said administrator based on one or more credentials of said user but not the one or more credentials of said administrator, wherein said user has all rights and privileges of said administrator while acting as proxy for said administrator." Stolfo does not teach or suggest such a feature. In fact, in the Office Action mailed February 23, 2007 at page 2, section 2 states that Stolfo fails to disclose the feature.

Instead, the Office Action relies on Wood as disclosing the feature. Nonetheless, the Applicants respectfully submit that Wood fails to teach or suggest "allowing said user to use said Access System to access resources as proxy for said administrator based on one or more credentials of said user but not the one or more credentials of said administrator, wherein said user has all rights and privileges of said administrator while acting as proxy for said administrator." In contrast, Wood's single logon for accessing multiple resources does not allow a user to act as proxy for an administrator. When the user in Wood logs on and accesses a first resource and subsequently accesses a second resource and so on, the user accesses all of the resource as himself. In contrast, the user in claim 1 accesses the Access System as a proxy for the administrator. Accordingly, accessing multiple resources under one login is not the same as

acting as proxy for an administrator. Thus, Wood fails to teach or suggest "allowing said user to use said Access System to access resources as proxy for said administrator" as recited by claim 1, and similarly as recited by claims 24, 32, 40 and 45.

Furthermore, when the user in Wood switches between accessing resources, the user's rights and privileges do not change. However, when the user in claim 1 acts as proxy for the administrator, the user has the same rights and privileges of the administrator. Thus, the user's rights and privileges are changed to be the same as the administrator's rights and privileges. Consequently, Wood fails to teach or suggest that "said user has all rights and privileges of said administrator while acting as proxy for said administrator" as recited by claim 1, and similarly as recited by claims 24, 32, 40 and 45. For at least these reasons, claims 1-18, 22-40, 42-45 and 47-49 are distinguishable from Stolfo in view of Wood, either individually or when combined, and should be allowed.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Dated: May 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,


William J. Daley
Reg. No. 52,471

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000 (Denver)
Fax: 303-571-4321 (Denver)
WJD:sbm
61011960 v1